The MINISTER for REVENUE and FINANCE (Rajamantrapravina K. V. Anantaraman).—The member seems to be very much dissatisfied about the progress of the work. His views will be communicated to the local officers and instructions will be issued to them that the work should be expedited.

Mr. A. P. BASAVALINGE GOWDA.—Were not tenders called for and was not the work proposad to be got done under contract system ?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—Yes. But the work was not found to be progressing satisfactorily and so, the contract was cancelled and the work taken up as *amani*.

Mr. A. P. BASAVALINGE GOWDA.—Could not the work be entrusted to some other contractor now ?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—The work is nearing completion and there is no necessity for such a course.

Mr. A. P. BASAVALINGE GOWDA.—Was it not possible to have entrusted it to another contractor instead of taking it up as *amani* ?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—Not possible to say that now.

Mr. A. P. BASAVALINGE GOWDA.—Is it not a fact that under the *amani* system, both the expenditure and the delay will be greater ?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—That is not always the case.

Mr. A. P. BASAVALINGE GOWDA.—Will the work be expedited ?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.— Yes.

Supersession of the Harnahalli Municipality.

Q.—109. **Mr. S. SIDDANNIAH (Arsikere—Rural).**

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) how long ago a municipality was established at Harnahalli, Arsikere Taluk ;

(*b*) the reasons for superseding that municipality ;

(*c*) the average income and expenditure per year of the municipality ;

(*d*) whether the opinion of the Comptroller to Government was obtained before superseding that municipality ;

(*e*) if so, the opinion of the Comptroller ;

(*f*) whether any petitions have been received urging that the municipality should not be superseded ; if so, have the petitioners been furnished with any replies after reviewing the petitions ;

(*g*) the reasons for not establishing a village panchayet, even though it is a long time since the municipality was superseded ?

A.—**The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, LAW DEPARTMENT (Mr. H. V. Narayana Rao).**—

(*a*) Since 1918.

(*b*) It was not superseded but abolished owing to its poor financial condition.

(*c*)—

Average Income.	*Average Expenditure.*
Rs. 1,200.	Rs. 1,200.

(*d*) and (*e*) It is not required.

(*f*) Yes. No individual endorsements were given as the notification abolishing the municipality was published in the *Mysore Gazette* (*vide* Notification No. L. 6596/Ml. 23-40-3, dated 8th March, 1941).

(*g*) A village panchayet has been established (*vide* Notification No. L. Dis. V-P.C. 3897-40, dated 25th July 1941, Kannada Gazette, page 484, Part III-3, dated 7-8th August 1941).

Mr. S. SIDDANNIAH.—Before the establishment of a municipality in the place, was it a village panchayet ?

The MINISTER for LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT and PUBLIC HEALTH (Mr. H. B. Gundappa Gowda).— I think it was a union.

Mr. S. SIDDANNIAH.—After it was converted into a municipality, did not the income go down ?

Mr. H. B. GUNDAPPA GOWDA.—Yes.

Mr. S. SIDDANNIAH.—If so, could not the municipality have been abolished earlier ?

Mr. H. B. GUNDAPPA GOWDA.—Government wanted to give some time to the municipality to see if its income would improve. But there were no signs of improvement and so it was abolished.

Mr. S. SIDDANNIAH.—Before abolishing a municipality, is it not necessary to consult the Comptroller?

Mr. H. B. GUNDAPPA GOWDA.—No. The Deputy Commissioner's report will do.

Mr. S. SIDDANNIAH.—Before the municipality was abolished was another election held?

Mr. H. B. GUNDAPPA GOWDA.—Notice.

Mr. S. C. SURYANARAYANA SETTY.—At the time that election was ordered, were not the Government aware that the income of the municipality had gone down very much?

Mr. H. V. NARAYANA RAO.—No.

Mr. S. C. SURYANARAYANA SETTY.—Were the Government aware that all the candidates who stood for election were Congress members?

Mr. H. V. NARAYANA RAO.—Notice.

Mr. S. C. SURYANARAYANA SETTY.—Are not the Government aware that all of them have been put to a lot of unnecessary inconvenience by virtue of their elections being set at naught?

Mr. H. V. NARAYANA RAO.—No.

Mr. S. C. SURYANARAYANA SETTY.—In future at least, will the Government see that municipalities are not abolished soon after elections?

Mr. H. V. NARAYANA RAO.—If similar cases arise, we shall consider that aspect.

Another MEMBER.—Will other municipalities also be abolished if their incomes decline?

The MINISTER for REVENUE and FINANCE (Rajamantrapravina K. V. Anantaraman).—If their affairs also are similar to those in the municipality under reference, they may be abolished.

The MEMBER.—Is not the income of the village even now more or less the same as the average for the previous years?

Mr. H. V. NARAYANA RAO.—That was not the only ground on which Government took a decision. Meetings were not being held. There were factions in the village. For all those reasons, Government had to abolish the municipality.

The MEMBER.—Was it not a fact that because the members of one particular party were returned in the elections, there was no scope at all for any factions in the municipal council?

Mr. H. V. NARAYANA RAO.—That is more than I could say.

Mr. C. RAMASWAMY SETTY.—Before the abolition, had the Council met?

Mr. H. V. NARAYANA RAO.—Notice.

Mr. N. CHANNAPPA.—The municipality existed since 1918. Ever since that date, had a similar question come up in any shape?

Mr. H. V. NARAYANA RAO.—Notice.

Mr. N. CHANNAPPA.—When did the Deputy Commissioner make the recommendation for the abolition of the municipality? Was it after or before the elections took place?

Mr. H. V. NARAYANA RAO.—It was in October 1940. I do not remember whether it was before or after the elections took place.

Mr. N. CHANNAPPA.—Are the Government aware that there is an impression that because all the members returned belonged to the Congress party, the Deputy Commissioner recommended the abolition of the municipality?

Mr. H. V. NARAYANA RAO.—No.

Mr. N. CHANNAPPA.—Are there not municipalities in the State with an income of even less than Rs. 1,200 each?

Mr. H. V. NARAYANA RAO.—Notice.

Mr. N. CHANNAPPA.—When the municipality was abolished, what was the amount which it had at credit in the treasury under *mohatarfa* revenue?

Mr. H. V. NARAYANA RAO.—Rs. 600 odd.

Mr. N. CHANNAPPA.—When so much money was available, on what basis did the authorities come to the conclusion that the municipality was not able to meet the expenditure on local wants and therefore deserved to be abolished?

Mr. H. V. NARAYANA RAO.—I have already answered that question.

Mr. N. CHANNAPPA.—After the municipality was abolished, did the rate-payers petition Government that the village should be reconstituted as a municipality again?

Mr. H. V. NARAYANA RAO.—Yes.

Mr. N. CHANNAPPA.—How were these petitions disposed of ?

Mr. H. V. NARAYANA RAO.—That the orders already passed needed no reconsideration.

Mr. N. CHANNAPPA.—What was the basis on which that order was passed ?

Mr. H. V. NARAYANA RAO.—I cannot enumerate all the reasons of which there were 7 or 8.

Mr. N. CHANNAPPA.—A panchayet has been constituted now. Does it consist of only nominated members or both elected and nominated ?

Mr. H. V. NARAYANA RAO.—Notice.

Announcement by the President of the Representations selected for Discussion.

The PRESIDENT informed the House that he had selected the following representations for discussion that day and that, before they were disposed of, he would make a further selection:—

Nos. 79, 88, 90, 92, 93, 97, 99 and 100, 103, 107, 112, 115, 118, 126, 138, 156, 159 and 160.

Suggestion to defer the Ruling by the Chair on the Point of Order *re* Comment on Chair's Ruling.

Mr. N. RAMA RAO referred to the promised ruling on the point of order raised by Mr. F. C. Devaraj Urs and requested the President to be pleased to defer the ruling for the present as party leaders were likely to come to an understanding on the question at issue, similar to the one that had been arrived at by party leaders in the Indian Legislative Assembly in 1938.

Rao Bahadur N. S. NANJUNDIAH also made the same request.

Mr. A. MIDDLETON, however, wished that the President gave a ruling immediately. While urging this view, he pointed out that Mr. Chengalaraya Reddy, who had averred in the course of his reply to the discussion on the previous day that he never acted contrary to Standing Orders or to the President's decisions, was not free from blame. Because, after the President gave the ruling on the adjournment motion, instead of bowing to it as he was bound to do under the rules, not only did he go on speaking but afterwards staged a walk-out with the other members of his party. That, the speaker thought, was disobedience to the Chair's ruling in action though not in words. The speaker wished that that action of the member be also taken due notice of by the President, while giving a ruling.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY rose to offer an explanation in view of the remarks of the previous speaker.

The PRESIDENT said that he had thought that Mr. Middleton was going to say something about the suggestion to defer the ruling. But the remarks which the member had offered would have been more relevant if they had been made at the proper time. He, however, thought there was no necessity for Mr. Chengalaraya Reddy to offer any further explanation at that stage.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY replied that he would have no objection to sit quiet if Mr. Middleton also did not press the matter.

The PRESIDENT stated that so far as he, at any rate, was concerned, he would not press it. He had also no objection to defer his ruling, as that seemed to be the opinion of some of the members.

Mr. A. N. RAMA RAO pointed out that it was only two members that were in favour of a ruling being deferred, but that he and most other members wished it otherwise.

Mr. Bhupalam R. CHANDRASEKHARAYYA doubted the propriety of the present discussion in view of the President's decision to defer his ruling.

Mr. S. C. MALLIAH wanted permission to make a few remarks on the point of order as he could not get a chance to speak on the previous day.

Mr. S. N. M. RAZVI objected to any more speeches, as nearly a full day had already been allowed to discuss the matter and observed that if one particular member was allowed to speak, it was likely that many other members would claim the same right.

The PRESIDENT agreed that it was so.

Mr. S. C. MALLIAH then said that in that case he would be satisfied with requesting the President to deal with the question in all its aspects in giving his ruling.

REPRESENTATIONS—*contd.*

No. 79.—Increasing the representation of Muslims in the higher cadres (teaching staff) of the University.

Mr. T. M. SABJU SAB (Kadur-Tarikere-Koppa-Narasimharajapura - Sringeri, Mahomedan—Rural).

Mr. T. M. SABJU SAB prayed that, as the representation of the Muslim community in the University was very meagre, Government be pleased to appoint more Muslims to the teaching staff, especially in the higher cadres of the service, offering better and more attractive terms to them than at present.

The MINISTER for EDUCATION (Mr. J. Mahomed Imam) stated that the existing grades were by no means discouraging and that the prospects of those in the higher cadres of the service were attractive enough. He added that whenever Muslim candidates with requisite qualifications were forthcoming, their claims were being considered.

Mr. Khaji SYED YUSUF SAHIB enquired whether there were any Muslims in the higher cadres at all, though he agreed that there were a few in the lowest cadre.

Mr. J. MAHOMED IMAM pointed out that one Muslim gentleman was an Assistant Professor.

Mr. Khaji SYED YUSUF SAHIB pointed out that that was only for teaching Persian. He said that there was not even one Muslim for teaching other subjects.

Mr. J. MAHOMED IMAM replied that there were some in the lower cadres and that as chances arose they would get the benefit of the higher cadres.

Mr. Khaji SYED YUSUF SAHIB represented that it would take not less than 20 to 30 years for them to get promotion to the higher cadres and suggested that, as in the case of probationers in the Revenue Department, Muslim lecturers be appointed in the lower cadre to begin with, and promoted to the higher cadre, provided, of course, they had the requisite qualifications.

Mr. J. MAHOMED IMAM pointed out that lecturers could not be likened to probationers in other departments. The posts in the higher (professorial) cadres could be filled in by promotion when vacancies occurred. If at the time such vacancies arose, Muslim lecturers with suitable qualifications were available in the lower cadre, their cases would surely be considered on merits

Mr. SHAIK AHAMED SAHEB wanted to know whether a Professor of Urdu had been appointed.

Mr. J. MAHOMED IMAM replied that the question was under consideration.

Dr. S. P. CHINNAPPA observed that formerly only persons passing very high in the Civil Service Examination were being appointed in the higher cadres of Government service, on the ground that only in that way could the best available brains be secured. But latterly, probationers were being nominated and even these were acquitting themselves as efficiently as any others. He, therefore, thought that even in the University the system of nominating probationers might be adopted with advantage. It was not necessary to strictly adhere to the rule that only those with very high academical qualifications should be selected to the professorial cadres. If selection was based on too high a standard, many lecturers belonging to backward communities would have no chance of promotion at all. After all, there might not be very much to choose as between a B.Sc. and an M.Sc., though the latter degree was certainly a higher one. On the other hand, it might so happen that a B.Sc. might be even superior to an M.Sc. in certain respects. So, making promotions to higher cadres entirely dependent upon very high academical qualifications would sometimes be neither fair nor desirable. He therefore suggested that a certain percentage of posts in the higher cadres be reserved for nomination of applicants from backward communities, even if they were not the most brilliant of the applicants.

Mr. A. N. RAMA RAO said that he was not a little suprised that, of all persons, Dr. Paul Chinnappa who had gone abroad